

REMARKS

1. In the section "Response to Amendment" the Examiner asked which of references or which parts of the drawings have been changed or replaced. The changes submitted with the drawings in our Amendment C were the following:

- 5) Reference numerals 36 and 38 that designate the second and third posts gripping the peripheral edges of the wafers were introduced into Fig. 5;
- 6) The following reference numerals were introduced into Fig. 8:
 - 42 - stepper motor
 - 44 - base plate
 - 52a – 52b through-beam sensor
 - 54a – 54b - through-beam sensor
 - 56a - 56b -front edge through-beam sensor
- 7) Reference numeral 51 that designates the accelerometer was introduced into Fig. 10;
- 8) Reference numeral 44A that designates a base plate was introduced into Fig. 11;
- 5) Reference numeral 66 that designates the microcontroller, reference numeral 44E that designates the base plate, and reference numeral 32E that designates the pin were introduced to Fig. 13.

The Examiner asked why some paragraphs have been replaced and stated that it is not unclear why some paragraphs were replaced. In one of the office actions the Examiner said that it is not necessary to underline the new words and cross-out the deleted words. That is why the Examiner did not see the following changes made in the replaced paragraphs:

- 1) "(Fig. 4)" is introduced into the second line of the replacement paragraph on page 15 after the words "sensors 50, 52a, 52b, 54a, 54b, 56a, 56b"
- 2) "Fig. 8" is introduced into the second line of the replacement paragraph on page 16;
- 3) In the last paragraph of page 16, symbol "a" was replaced by symbol "A";
- 4) "(Fig. 10)" was introduced into the last line of the replacement paragraph on page 19.

Regarding the rejection of the claims, the Examiner states that in the previous Amendment C the applicants have deleted a part of the allowable subject from Claim 35. The reason for that was that the applicants wanted to broaden Claim 1, but after analyzing this claim over the cited references we decided to restore the aforementioned allowable matter in Claim 35. We appreciate that the Examiner indicated to this omission. The new version of Claim 35 contains the previously deleted wording: "said gripping force control means having a sliding member connected to said linear precision drive mechanism and moveable in the direction of said longitudinal axis, said sliding member having a first pin rigidly connected thereto, said second linking member and said third linking member have respective slots in the direction transverse to said longitudinal axis, said respective slots being at least partially overlapped, said first pin being slidably guided in said respective slots."

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore, the applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action they respectfully solicit.

Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

Applicant has made a diligent effort to amend the claims of this application so that they define novel structure, which is also unobvious. If, for any reason, the Examiner believes that the claims of this application are not yet in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests his constructive assistance and suggestions pursuant to the spirit of MPEP § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j). This will enable the undersigned to place this application in fully

allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings. The Examiner is authorized to make any needed minor corrections or changes.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:

Morgulis Boris Kesil E. Gershenson

Boris Kesil

1040 Di Giulio Avenue #200

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. 408-747-8787